

Dear Sam and Joe,

4/28/91

You see the NYTimes (and Jewish press) and I do not ^{but} when I read ^{today's} the enclosed Post article I wondered if the Times carried anything like it. Probably the Times' correspondents, like the Post's Goshko, are essentially pro-State Department because this is what the system requires if they are to successfully cover State. I know that Goshko hews to his paper's and State's line on other ~~issues~~, like on Nicaragua, when the local paper, in puffing up our local conservative Congresswoman, real hot on the Contras, disclosed that the Reagan White House was using military appropriations to take probably a fair percentage of the Members and others there weekly and taking them to the same anti-government people, as part of a major propaganda effort. Goshko and the Post would not touch this.

What I think this story really means is that the anti-Israel and pro-Arab Bush administration is getting ready to lay the blame for Baker's failure to achieve anything on Israel, as they and he have in the past. To now every word from Baker and his party had been along the line of Israel preventing peace. While this story holds a few minor indications of the anti-peace positions of other countries, all Arab, the thrust is anti-Israel.

Had Baker/Bush wanted any successful negotiations toward the beginning of a settlement they'd not have supported what Shamir is criticized for in not responding, a UN role. With the secretary-general and a majority of the members openly Israeli why should Shamir or any Israeli leader accept them for a role when the certainty is they'd be anti-Israel?

I know Sam has been optimistic, or at least a little hopeful, and as you know I've held all along that it will not happen.

One reason is the venomous anti-Israel records all the ^{Muslim} government's have, moderated a bit by Sadat and inflaming again under Lubarek, all the incitations of their masses at least since World War II to divert them from domestic questions, beginning with any kind of reasonably free government and democratic institutions. This need those governments have is unchanged but now, even if they wanted to make changes, they know they'd not survive it. They don't want peace because their survival requires the absence of peace.

I've wondered from the beginning why Baker was making this kind of effort when he had to know that there is no prospect of Israel surviving what he demands of it, meaning that whatever his personal position may be what he is up to demands of it. Perhaps he did expect that the pressure he could build under the Shamir government might force it to make the concessions demanded of it alone, but if he did he flaunts ignorance of the actualities of that troubled area, including the minimum required for Israel's survival with the semblance of domestic tranquility established in 1967. He also fails to recognize what I am confident is a major change within Israel among its peaceniks brought about by the behavior of those Arabs they considered friends with whom they were trying to establish a basis for peace for land, an impossibility in any event. Those Arabs hailed Saddam and cheered his SCUDding of Israel and rational Israelis cannot and will not overlook or forget that.

On his part Bush has always been pro-Arab and pro-Oil interests. He would have been more overtly anti-Israel than he has been and is being through Baker were it not for the power of the Jewish vote in this country. I call to your attention that those here who were Arafat's running dogs in getting him talked to by the Bushers have been silent since Saddam launched his SCuds against Israel.

The more time passes as it is and has been passing the more convinced I become that minimum Israeli security requirements, aside from the obvious other considerations, require retention and ultimately incorporation of Judea and Samaria. (Have you noticed the absence of any campaign for a free Kurdistan, which could be created by taking territory from larger and more powerful states and where there is a much ^{stronger} case than Israel's arabs can make?) And the more time passes the more I think that when there is a solution of any kind it will be when the Arabs start calling Jordan Palestine, after they take it from Hussein, with whom, along with Saddam, the Bushers are getting close despite the recent war. But that it is a crazy war is not new, is it? Best,

would

Sam